REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Final Official Action of November 30, 2004 and as a part of a continued prosecution application submitted pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.53(d).

At the outset, applicants' attorney wishes to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during a telephone interview held April 19, 2005 in which the Examiner agreed that applicants' request for reconsideration filed December 8, 2004 overcomes the earlier Double-Patenting rejection to earlier presented claims 1-5 and 10-12.

It is further submitted that the amendments to the application made herein also places claims 1-5 and 7-12 in condition for allowance.

The Final Action of November 30, 2004 rejected claims 1, 3-5, 7 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Marron U.S. Patent 5,030,041 (the '041 patent). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is first to be noted that the boring bar system described in the '041 patent requires **three** separate drive sources, the first being motor 156 that drives (rotates) the boring bar. See column 4, line 18, of the '041 patent. The second drive is the crank 211 or a motor that may be substituted for the crank. It moves the cutting head assembly 35 axially along the length of the boring bar. See column 5, line 7, of the '041 patent. The third drive is a motor coupled to the shaft 66 for moving the cutting tool 56 in a radial direction. See column 4, line 68, of the '041 patent. Applicants' boring bar system, on the other hand, requires only **two** drives, i.e., one for rotating the boring bar and the other for driving the lead screw. The recited second drive means also includes a control device operatively coupled to the elongated lead screw, the control device having a manually adjustable control shaft which, when turned in a first direction, inhibits axial movement of the cutting head member and imparts radial displacement to the slide and tool bit. Marron clearly fails to teach or suggest the presently recited "control device" now set out in element (f) of amended independent claim 1. Thus, the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claims 1, 3-5, 7 and 10 should be withdrawn.

The Final Action also rejected claims 2 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Marron '041 patent. This rejection is also respectfully traversed. First off, claim 6 has now been canceled in view of the amendment made to claim 1. Further, claim 2 depends from allowable claim 1 and it too should now be found to be in condition for allowance.

By way of conclusion, then, the present amendment to the claims defines an invention that is neither anticipated by nor rendered obvious in view of the Marron '041 patent and, accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

NIKOLAI & MERSEREAU, P.A.

Thomas J. Nikolai
Registration No. 19,283
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 820
Minneapolis, MN 55402-3325
Telephone: 612-339-7461
Fax: 612-349-6556